



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,466	11/29/2001	Bruce Allan Makinen	10011292-1	5681

7590 10/20/2004

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER

BAYERL, RAYMOND J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,466

Applicant(s)

MAKINEN, BRUCE ALLAN

Examiner

Raymond J. Bayerl

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 302m 03
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 2173

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "menu 303" should be 302, page 9, line 16; "device(s) 118" should be 112, page 11, line 19.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 13, 15 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos-Gomez ("Santos-Gomez"; US #2003/0065705 A1) in view of Angiulo et al. ("Angiulo"; US #6,456,304 B1).

As per independent claim 1's "method for managing process control" in which "displaying a plurality of objects...corresponding to one or more steps in a sequential process" is involved, Santos-Gomez similarly illustrate a TASK ROSTER in which a visual list of component tasks (Abstract) is presented (see fig 2, paragraph 0009). In Santos-Gomez, "visually distinguishing the object to indicate that the corresponding step has been successfully completed" takes place, since the task roster can provide status information regarding the completion status of the component tasks that have been performed in a prescribed order.

While Santos-Gomez's task roster 206 can indicate which of those component tasks have been completed and which have yet to be completed (paragraph 0025), the reference does not enter into the details of "one of the objects corresponding to a previously completed step being selected and successfully completed". However,

Art Unit: 2173

Angiulo's PROCEDURAL TOOLBAR USER INTERFACE, which like Santos-Gomez is for enabling a user to make a series of selections in a procedural order (Abstract) also allows a user to select and change any selection previously made, as desired, with the resultant changes effecting the selections and menus to the right of or below the changed selection (see also col 3, lines 1 – 18). Thus, Angiulo's procedure is capable of "determining whether any other previously completed steps are dependent upon the changes made to the previously completed step", since this is part of revising the succeeding menus in the TOOLBAR.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to perform "visually distinguishing" of "a plurality of objects" as per Santos-Gomez, with the provision for handling previously made selections' re-selection as per Angiulo, with the motivation being to allow a user to make a complete and verified set of entries when something earlier must be changed. Angiulo's menus to the right of or below the changed selection would carry the task roster markings in such a combination.

Independent claims 9, 15 are similar in substance to claim 1 and rejected using a similar line of reasoning.

In the Santos-Gomez/Angiulo combination, Santos-Gomez's prescribed order will carry over to the revisions needed when the previously made item is picked in Angiulo, and thus, "the other previously completed steps are completed again in a predefined order" (claims 2, 10, 16). The task roster, as shown in Santos-Gomez's fig 2, is updated

Art Unit: 2173

by "visually distinguishing the objects...to indicate that they have been completed" (claims 3, 11, 17).

Claims 4 and 5 deal with the situation envisioned in Santos-Gomez/Angiulo, where "visually distinguishing" is applied to "object" instances for "successfully completed" and "to be completed again" status. As noted above, Santos-Gomez's visual status indicator specifically shows this condition, as by "displaying another object (e.g., a check mark) adjacent to the object" (claims 4, 12, 18), which is "modifying the display of the object" (claims 5, 13, 19).

When a user of Angiulo is given a Santos-Gomez task roster that is updated when a previously-completed item is chose, "successfully completing the corresponding steps in the sequential process" will occur, as in the prescribed order of Santos-Gomez (claim 7). In each disclosure, the interface is given as a toolbar adjunct to "a separate window of the graphical user interface" (claim 8).

4. Claims 6, 14, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos-Gomez in view of Angiulo and Applicant's Admission as to Prior Art in the specification ("Applicant's Admission").

In these claims, (claim 6 quoted as exemplary), "the steps in the sequential process are related to controlling an automatic x-ray inspection system configured to detect manufacturing defects in printed circuit boards", an application that is not specifically shown as a potential use in Santos-Gomez or Angiulo.

However, such automated systems **were** well-known in the art, as indicated at pages 1 – 3 of Applicant's Admission in the present specification. Indeed, "Control

Art Unit: 2173

systems implemented in current PCB inspection systems typically employ a graphical user interface to assist a user in the process of generating the inspection program".

Thus, it would have been further obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the Santos-Gomez/Angiulo combination as claimed for the purpose in Applicant's Admission, for Santos-Gomez and Angiulo both are concerned with the proper sequential execution of tasks in a process.


5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The remaining US Patent documents made of record (see attached form PTO-892) relate to operator interfaces for assisting a user in completing a process.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Bayerl whose telephone number is (703) 305-9789 through the month of October 2004 and (571) 272-4045 thereafter. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F from 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM ET.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116 through the month of October 2004 and (571) 272-4048 thereafter. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by FAX **must be directed** to the central FAX number (703) 872-9306.

8. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

7 October 2004